UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,429	04/27/2006	Do-Hyung Kim	P0777	4724
34610 KED & ASSOC	7590 03/22/201 CIATES, LLP	EXAMINER		
P.O. Box 22120	00	COX, ALEXIS K		
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3744	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/22/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/577,429	KIM, DO-HYUNG		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ALEXIS K. COX	3744		

	ALEXIS K. COX	3744	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelication (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid aban ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	t waisan to the plate of filling a buist		
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beta 	isideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mnliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant Amendment (i	101-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmen	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>2, 5, 6, and 8-12</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Frantz F. Jules/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3744			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the applicant's argument on page 9 that TaeDuk does not disclose the compressor to operate in two directions, but instead to operate at two speeds in a single direction, the examiner respectfully suggest that, as the purpose of operating at a slower speed for a predetermined time period before switching directions is to prevent an abrupt and damaging change in the system, and this need applies to both a compressor which reverses via valve operation and one which reverses via reversal of the operating motor, the rejection is valid.

It is further argued on page 10 that none of the applied references disclose or suggests when the operation mode of the refrigerator selected by the user is a power saving mode, rotating the compressor in the second direction, and when the temperature is higher than a pre-set temperature, rotating the compressor in the first rotation direction; however, this ignores that the purpose of the two compression ratios available in the two directions of Loprete is to better match the energy expenditure for compression to the load requirements of the system. To argue that a user-programmable thermostat would result in "merely swithing the compressor, rather than controlling a rotation speed of the compressor in a selected rotation direction" ignores the well-known variant of compressors in which they are variable-speed, which was explicitly addressed in the rejection in the final office action.